REMARKS

By this paper, Claims 1, 5, and 8 have been amended. Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 5, and 8 can be found at least in the specification as filed on page 11, line 38 to page 12, line 25, as well as elsewhere throughout the specification and figures. No new matter has been added by this amendment. Claims 1-15 remain pending and presented for Examination.

Discussion of Rejection of Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In particular, the Examiner has rejected independent Claims 1, 5, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,911,132 to Sloane in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,543,903 to Fogel.

In response to Applicant's arguments, the Examiner has stated that:

The Automated Data Integrity System ("DIA") of Fogel teaches obvious tests which check the data for completeness (Col. 9, lines 60-64). This clearly reads upon determining whether *sufficient* patient demographic data exists. Furthermore, the DIA system of Fogel teaches that the provider gathers information about payers' and regulators' audit criteria, and individual facilities' and chains' audit histories. Thus, the DIA service provides a facility data integrity tests and documentation prompts addressing circumstances that have prompted audits in the past (Col. 13, lines 8-25). Examiner submits that this process in Fogel is a broad and reasonable interpretation of the limitation of "searching other databases in an *attempt* to obtain missing demographic information." The system in Fogel is an automated computer process, thus one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that a search for information would include searching in databases, a means for storage of electronic data. Furthermore, the claim only requires that the search of other databases in an *attempt* obtain missing information. The claim language does not require that missing information be found, only that a search is done in an attempt to get the information. Examiner submits that a search of an audit history of a facility could qualify as an attempt to obtain missing information as the current audit may be missing information contained in past records.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 5, and 8 are patentable over the cited art, at least because they have been amended to recite additional limitations not taught by the cited references.

For example, amended Claim 1 is directed to a medical transportation database system having a demographic audit module configured to determine whether sufficient patient demographic data exists in the medical emergency database, search other databases in an attempt

to obtain missing demographic information, and retrieve at least a portion of the missing demographic information from at least one of the other databases.

As previously discussed, Fogel is generally directed to a system for identifying data integrity issues, and showing how they can be either resolved or addressed adequately by ancillary documentation. *See Fogel*, col. 3, ll. 33-36. The data integrity audit system of Fogel has two versions: a prospective (real-time) version, intended to prompt a user to correct data errors during data entry, and a retrospective version which offers perspectives on processes of assessment, coding, and documentation that could be producing invalid data, and gives advice for improving data integrity in specific area of weakness.

As an initial matter, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of Fogel. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the data integrity audit system teaches determining whether sufficient patient demographic data exists in a medical emergency database, Applicant respectfully submits that the search of information about payers' and regulators' audit criteria and individual facilities' and chains' audit histories is not an attempt to obtain missing patient demographic information, as information about audit criteria or histories would not be expected to contain missing patient demographic information.

Nevertheless, Applicant has also amended Claim 1 to recite that the demographic audit module is configured to retrieve at least a portion of the missing demographic information from at least one of the other databases. Applicant respectfully submits that this feature is clearly not taught by Fogel, which merely prompts a user to correct data errors or improve documentation during entry. This deficiency is also not cured by the other cited references. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references, as the references fail to teach at least a demographic audit module configured to retrieve at least a portion of the missing demographic information from at least one of the other databases.

Claim 5 has been amended to recite a method of auditing demographic data in an integrated emergency medical transportation database system, the method comprising, *inter alia*, retrieving at least a portion of the missing demographic information from at least one of the other databases. Claim 8 has been amended to recite an integrated emergency medical transportation database system having a data accuracy filter module, wherein the data accuracy filter module is configured to retrieve at least a portion of the missing demographic information from at least one

of the other databases. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 5 and 8 are patentable over the cited art for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

Similarly, as Claims 2-4, 6-7, and 9-15 depend from Claims 1, 5, and 8, respectively, Applicant respectfully submits that they are patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed with respect to Claims 1, 5, and 8, in addition to providing further patentable distinction. Furthermore, Applicant does not necessarily agree with the characterization of dependent claims or prior art made in these rejections.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicant is not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. In particular, Applicant believes that the claims as originally filed remain patentable over the cited art. Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date the independent claims in their original form, as well as any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are patentable over the cited art. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of all pending rejections, and the allowance of Claims 1-15.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: January 21, 2009   By:_____

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

AMEND

6507292
012009